

REMARKS

Claims 1-35, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected on prior art grounds.

Claim 32 stands rejected upon informalities. Claims 1, 12, 24, 32 are amended herein.

Moreover, the drawings are objected to. Accordingly, replacement sheets for the drawings are submitted herewith. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because, according to the Office Action, Figure 2(A) is unclear. Accordingly, the Applicant is attaching replacement drawings (replacement sheets) hereto in order to overcome this objection. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the fixed proportion.” Accordingly, claim 32 is amended herein to depend on claim 30 instead of claim 28. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

III. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-2, 5-12, 14, 17-24, 26, and 29-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Blades (U.S. Patent No. 5,706,448). Claims 3-4, 13, 15-16, 25, and 27-28

stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blades. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on the following discussion.

Blades teaches a method and system for efficiently managing a plurality of displayable objects within a display. The system displays a first plurality of graphic selections in a substantially circular formation. Each of the graphic selections are associated with one of the displayable objects. A rotatable pointer is displayed within the circular formation with the rotatable pointer including a movable control element located within the rotatable pointer. A second plurality of graphic selections are arranged in a substantially circular formation. The display of this second plurality of graphic selection may be altered in response to a selection of a graphic selection from the first plurality of graphic selections. A display of a displayable object associated with the selected graphic selection from the first plurality of graphic selections occurs utilizing the rotatable pointer and the removable control element.

The claimed invention, as provided in amended independent claims 1, 12, and 24 contain features, which are patentably distinguishable from the prior art reference of record. Specifically, claim 1 recites, “A graphic user interface comprising: a non-linear path region that corresponds to a list of items in a computer application; and a non-linear rotatable handle region that corresponds to a subset of the items in the list.” Additionally, amended independent claim 24 recites, “A method of manipulating data through a graphical user interface, said method comprising: corresponding a non-linear scrollbar to a list of items in a computer application; corresponding a non-linear rotatable region to an accessed portion of the list of items; and corresponding a partition region to predetermined transitions between items in the list.”

The Office Action is attempting to argue that the rotatable scroll bar 404 of Blades is

patentably analogous to the Applicant's rotatable handle region (rotatable thumb, rotatable region). However, this is an erroneous analogy. The scroll bar 404, 1008 of Blades is actually linear (see FIGS. 4A, 4B, 10A, and 10B of Blades). The non-linear aspect of Blades control icon 400, 420, 1000 lies in the rings 414, 416, 422, 1002, 1004, 1006, 1018, 1020 which is different from the scroll bar 404, 1008 itself. In other words, the scroll bar 404, 1008 in Blades may be rotatable, however it is linear with concentric rings configured around it. Conversely, in the Applicant's claimed invention the rotatable handle region is non-linear. This is a patentably distinguishable feature of the Applicant's claimed invention compared with Blades.

Amended independent claim 12 recites, “A non-linear scrollbar comprising: a geometric center point; an outer periphery region; a non-linear trough progressively winding tighter from said outer periphery region towards said geometric center point and corresponding to a list of items in a computer application; a rotatable thumb that corresponds to an accessed portion of the list of items, wherein said rotatable thumb is extendable anywhere between said geometric center point and said outer periphery region; a partition region that corresponds to predetermined transitions between items in the list; and a handle manipulator for maneuvering the rotatable thumb, wherein said handle manipulator maneuvers said rotatable thumb quicker towards said geometric center point than towards said outer periphery region.”

Furthermore, dependent claim 23 recites, “wherein said handle manipulator is a line outwardly extending from said geometric center point passed said outer periphery region.” The features defined by amended claims 12 and 23 are neither taught nor suggested in Blades. In particular Blades does not teach a geometric center point, an outer periphery region, and a non-trough that progressively winds tighter from said outer periphery region towards said geometric

center point. In fact, it is graphically demonstrable in Blades that the non-linear path regions in FIGS. 4A, 4B, 10A, and 10B are concentric with respect to the center point 406, 1010 and do not progressively wind tighter from the outer periphery 402 towards the center point 406, 1010. This is a significant distinction between Blades and the Applicant's claimed invention because this winding configuration facilitates the Applicant's handle manipulator to maneuver the rotatable region quicker towards said geometric center point than towards said outer periphery region. In other words, the handle manipulator 408, 410 in Blades cannot maneuver the rotatable scroll bar 404 more quickly in the center 406 compared to the outer periphery 402 because (1) the rotatable scroll bar 404 in Blades is not capable of extending to the outer periphery 402, (2) the movement of the rotatable scroll bar 404 does not change speeds depending on where it is with respect to the center 406, (3) there is no reason for the rotatable scroll bar 404 in Blades to move more quickly with respect to where it lies in relation to the center 406, and (4) the rotatable scroll bar 404 only rotates around the center point 406 and does not rotate at the outer periphery 402. Accordingly, Blades does not teach the Applicant's amended claimed invention and there is no motivation to alter Blades in the manner suggested by the Applicant's amended claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that the collective cited prior art do not teach or suggest the features defined by amended independent claims 1, 12, and 24 and as such, claims 1, 12, and 24 are patentable over Blades. Further, dependent claims 2-11, 13-23, and 25-35 are similarly patentable over Blades, not only by virtue of their dependency from patentable independent claims, respectively, but also by virtue of the additional features of the invention they define. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be

reconsidered and withdrawn. Moreover, the Applicant notes that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings, and no new matter is being added. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

IV. Formal Matters and Conclusion

With respect to the rejections of the drawings, replacement sheets of the drawings are submitted herewith. With respect to the rejections to the claims, the claims have been amended, above, to overcome these rejections. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections to the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-35, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 9, 2007

/Mohammad S. Rahman/

Mohammad S. Rahman

Registration No. 43,029

Gibb & Rahman, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (301) 261-8625
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154